

context+

B O O K S

June 16, 1999

Theodore J. Kaczynski
04475-046
P.O. Box 8500
Florence, CO 81226-8500

Dear Ted,

I received letter #52 on the fourth. I apologize for the delay in getting back to you. First I will give you my "book report" on "Ship of Fools" from a jerry-rigged historical perspective.

There was a book written by the same name (I never was interested enough to finish it) by Katherine Anne Porter. It enjoyed great popularity during the fifties and was a book of the month selection, among other things. More interesting, Sebastian Brant wrote the original allegory "Narrenschiff" in 1494. It is a long didactic poem in which Brant satirizes the follies and vices of the time. It has been compared to Goethe's *Werther* with regard to its popularity and folk status. In Brant's tale, all the fools are loaded in a ship bound for Narragonia, the land of fools. There are many descriptions that digress from the main plot based on the dull bulbs on the boat. The resulting lack of unity enables the poet to discuss all kinds of social, political, and religious conditions. Not only follies in the usual sense of the word are satirized, but also crimes and vices, which are conceived of as follies in accordance with the medieval way of thinking. Hence among the fools appear such people as usurers, gamblers, and adulterers. A chapter is devoted to each kind of folly and there are one hundred and twelve chapters in which one hundred and ten kinds of fools pass muster. As a work of art the poem does not rank high, though its tone is serious and earnest, especially where the poet pleads for his ideals, as in the chapter entitled "Von abgang des glouben" (on the decline of faith). In this poem, knowledge of self is praised as the height of wisdom. I thank you for the permission to post the story.

So much for that. Please find the check enclosed for the expenses you have had. I'm glad you've finally taken me up on the offer, and books await at your request.

I understand your stance with regard to 60 Minutes. I am hesitant to do an interview myself, but will seriously consider it. It places me in a strange position, since I am also your publisher. In the simplest of terms, it would be unorthodox. But I like that aspect, and if you are still interested I will set up an appointment to interview you as soon as I receive word from you that I should do so. It seems to me that you may feel obliged in some way, and you are not. If you want to work exclusively with _____, Fischler and EF!, you will find that I am supportive and will back you up on the choice if the media asks me about it. If you also want to work with me, I will be

pleased because I can be assured of the “transmission.” I will not have to worry whether or not someone has gone amok, since I will be able to keep close tabs on myself, etc. In the event that I come out there for an interview, would you like me to conduct it for print or with a media group to be taped on video? If I did a print interview, it would be placed in a mainstream publication.

I would like to mention that I have spoken to _____ on at least two separate occasions. Her stance regarding you has changed very much between my first conversation with her and the most recent one when she told me about the interview.¹ In March, she was standoffish about any association with you. This month she was supportive. I like her. Having said this, she has either been somewhat reserved with me (she did once say pejoratively that I am a liberal), or she is not intellectually advanced. I suspect an admixture of the two, since she holds degrees beyond the baccalaureate. My opinion with regard to her intellectual accomplishment is also based on gossip, passed on to me by Jensen, that you hold her in high esteem (Derrick is of course upset that he will not be interviewing you). I feel the very fact of this gossip suggests that I am not entirely wrong, but understand that the presence of gossip often suggests an emotional characteristic that has no bearing on one's intellectual capabilities.

p. 5, ¶ 2) While on the topic, I was disturbed by the accusations, reported to you, that I have an aggressive and abrasive manner. At times, there is a certain amount of stress associated with my position as your publisher. I regret having created the impression you reported, and will try to make amends if possible by avoiding such behavior in the future, since I don't like it much either. I apologize for putting you in the position of mediator.

Back to the interview with _____, when the media get wind of the interview they could lump together both you and EF!. Having said that, EF! will not be tempted to demonize you, which is attractive, and co-optation by such a group would not be entirely contrary to the fulfillment of your goals. I cannot say for sure what the effect will be, but I think it may be just the thing and I do not underestimate your understanding of the media and their uses. I also feel that Pacific Street will provide a reasonably risk-free situation. All engagements with people with the ability to distribute information is risky, since one must rely on their ability to do so and their willingness to do so honestly without special interest that would be damaging to you.

p. 2, ¶ 2) I am somewhat familiar with Sheldon's somatotyping, which makes me naturally aggressive. For years I tried to convince myself that I was an ectomorph, but alas it is not so.

p. 3, ¶ 2) I was glad to hear that you did not find my opinion entirely off-base with regard to the Manifesto.

p. 3, ¶ 4 – p. 4, ¶ 1) My lawyers want me to hold off on a visit to your mother until your family responds to the letter requesting permission. Thank you for your advice, which I will follow when the opportunity presents itself.

¹ The interview set for June 24 should be kept secret. If Chris Waits hears about it, he will use it to his advantage, since he has a theory about his birthday (same date) and events in your life.

p. 4, ¶ 2) I understand the situation with David and Linda. I spoke with your [redacted] and she corroborated. She was careful, but once she got going, there was much information that supports your thesis about your family. She could be helpful at a later junction. She did tell me that there was no way she would allow that information about [redacted] to be published. She went so far as to say that she likes me, but would not hesitate to sue me. The same goes for David, if he has or were to make a published comment that suggested [redacted] suffered from schizophrenia, she would sue him. I hope that you will agree to excise the information about [redacted], since it poses the above problem, your aunt is quite steadfast in her resolve, and the resulting lawsuit would hamper distribution of your book.

I understand your instructions with regard to interviewing your family and reiterate what I have already said in the above.

p. 7, ¶ 3) I have also been in contact with Der Spiegel. They are interested in writing an article on your book. Do not work with Hossli under any circumstances. He is a muckraker. If DS wants to write something about *Truth versus Lies*, they are free to do so. I have given a copy of the mss to Rolf Rietzler (the book review editor) under cover of a strict confidentiality agreement. It applies to him and the magazine. But Hossli cannot be trusted. I heard that he made suggestive remarks to [redacted] about your relationships with women. It does not bode well, and I doubt he will write anything worth reading. This is not the European journalist for you. I know a woman in Germany who is seriously interested in you (she also studies anthropology). She is an award-winning journalist. Let me know if I should contact her. She writes for both DS and Stern and she is worth contacting should you want to explore the matter further.

I have asked Korzenik about a copyright lawyer, and he has not come up with anyone willing to do it *pro bono*. I have a call in to Bonnie regarding Kenyon and Kenyon. But I have no answer yet and I was waiting to respond to your query when I had a definite report, which I do not have.

We are almost finished with the legal read-through. There are some points we have not gone through, but it seems Miller is accepting your edits. There is one major problem. Maryland law states that it is illegal to make public disclosures of facts that represent groundless invasion of privacy. It is a bad law, since there have been precedents that severely limit what is known as the "cat's out of the bag" clause. Verbal disclosures do not count as an invasion of this zone, only publication. We are currently trying to find out from Quin whether Investigator Report # 122 (reproduced in Appendix 6) is still under seal. If it is not public, we will not be able to print it. Schwartz's comments to the press will be considered harmless by a judge. They will then most likely determine that the publication of the facts regarding his family are an invasion of privacy and distribution of your book will be halted. Of course this will only happen if JS sues, which is a possibility too high to risk. If your aunt is willing to sue, why not your brother's best friend? We have not determined the status of the report yet. In addition, if we assign a number to JS, he is still identifiable in the quote from *Mad Genius*. We might be able to scratch that citation and

heavily redact identifiable facts from the report, but this seems unlikely because the report is so specific (i.e., Burn-ice, the hammer beating, suicide, etc).

This is the most serious thing that has come up. I was able to verify that Edward "Benny" Bedwell was arrested for the murder of the Grimes sisters. But it is not clear that he confessed to the crimes for fame. He was coerced into playing the patsy and later tried to recant. Having said this, I am willing to look for articles that suggest Bedwell admitted to the crimes for fame, since the story I found cited controversy and competing views with regard to his guilt and admission. I think there is enough to go on in terms of the statement made on p.19. He is now 62, if he is still alive, and was last known to reside in Florida. But no one has been able to locate him or any relatives of the Grimes family for some time now.

I just this moment got off the phone with [redacted] e did not strike me to be entirely reliable, but he was not falling over himself to give me information. Also: he had nothing good to say about Waits, and even joked that I might give Waits a call when he could not supply me with the information I had asked him about.

Here's what he said: Furnished you with a chainsaw and cut wood with you on weekends sometime during the 70s. That you once knocked on his door after losing a load of wood that you were hauling with a pickup truck. He did not remember anyone by the name of [redacted]. I tried to refresh his memory by asking about someone who spent time around Lincoln and might have mentioned the KGB. He then said that you once were on Baldy together and that you pointed up the mountain and claimed to have a hideout where the KGB would never find you. I asked him if he was sure, and he responded that he was. He then said that you were not too dirty during the seventies, and that Chris Waits was wrong about that. I then asked him whether or not he could think of who this [redacted] guy might be, and he said that there was a person who owned land around Helena who owned a cabin somewhere. He added that this person was somewhat peculiar and that he might be [redacted]. He apparently remembers what he told the investigators, since he went so far as to say that the conversation on Baldy occurred "somewhere around 1974." Obviously, he was unable to tell me if AP was still alive. I also called one [redacted] in Florence, MT and she did not know of a relative by that name. She was young (I could hear a baby in the background) and did say that AP might be a second cousin. Miller wants you to drop the proper name and use "a gentleman" as it already occurs in the text.

We are waiting for the letters from your family quoted in the mss and the investigator reports (which we need to check for accuracy). The letters may become necessary if we need to tailor the material for fair use. But Miller thinks that he can do it without the material since copyright will have much to do with use of necessary information to refute damage to your reputation. I think there may be a chance to get this thing done in time for our press date, if you will trust me that the changes have been entered accurately. They will be.

Miller wants me to write a preface that makes comment on my opinion of your honesty and accuracy. It would be written with Appendix 10, where you mention that the investigator reports

may not be as accurate as something produced by hard science. He wants me to spell out for readers that this does not mean you doubt the accuracy of the reports (and that hard science is very, very exact), that they were conducted for a specific purpose (i.e., to bolster the argument of mental defect), and that you are the most honest person I have ever encountered (seconded by Scharlette Holdman, who said you are "constitutionally incapable of lying."). Would this be acceptable to you? I would be very brief. Miller and Korzenik insist that it is important to be as clear as possible with readers.

If at all possible, please respond to the material here post-haste. Another will follow soon with a final wrap up. Perhaps tomorrow.

I look forward to corresponding with you after the appeal is less time-consuming and *Truth versus Lies* is at the printers.

Yours,

Beau.